UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,951	03/07/2005	Janne Muhonen	59643.00579	8417
	7590 05/13/200 DERS & DEMPSEY L	EXAMINER		
8000 TOWERS	CRESCENT DRIVE	BROOKS, SHANNON		
14TH FLOOR VIENNA, VA 22182-6212			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/522,951	MUHONEN, JANNE		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SHANNON R. BROOKS	2617		

	SHANNON R. BROOKS	2617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 July 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origing the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period fo	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second c	usideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying th				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claims 29-67. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		l be entered and an ex	planation of			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but		•				
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see continuation sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 						
13. Other:	, , ,					
/Nick Corsaro/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617	/Shannon R. Brooks/ Examiner, Art Unit 2617					

Continuation of 11, does not place the application in position for allowace because: of the following.

The applicant argues that Hanson and Kallin do not disclose or suggest "comparing the time threshold to a threshold time limit; and in response to the comparing, providing, as the current location, the last known location if the time is within the threshold time limit." However, Hanson teaches, In Figure 5, comparing the time to a threshold time limit, determing if the old cell registration number is equal to the new cell registration number (providing, as the current location, the last known location if the old cell registration number equals the new cell registration number), and then paging accordingly. Therefore, Hanson meets the claim limitation of "comparing the time threshold to a threshold time limit; and in response to the comparing, providing, as the current location, the last known location if the time is within the threshold time limit." Therefore, the previous rejections of claims 29-67 are maintained.

The applicant argues that Hanson and Kallin, alone or in combination, do not teach the present invention. However. Kallin is an exemplary reference from a relevant subclass and was combined with Hanson because it teaches the stated claim limitation of "providing as a current location," as set forth in the final office action.

The Amendment to independent claim 55 has been noted and will be entered upon appeal. The amendment explains the meaning of an acronym that is well known in the art and has no effect on rejected claims in the opinion of the Examiner.